

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:) Art Unit: 1639
))
CHRISTENSEN, et al.) Examiner: STEELE, A.
))
Serial No.: 10/529,397) Washington, D.C.
))
Filed: March 28, 2005) January 8, 2009
))
For: SPATIALLY ENCODED) Docket No.: CHRISTENSEN=12
 POLYMER MATRIX)
) Confirmation No.: 6716

ELECTION WITH TRAVERSE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

In response to the species restriction requirement mailed December 15, 2008, applicants respond as follows.

1. We believe that the restriction is moot because claims 104-105 have been cancelled on even date herewith. However, to avoid any question of responsiveness, we hereby elect with traverse species 2 - relative positions.

It is noted that relative positions are already cited in, e.g., withdrawn claim 43, and that absolute positions (the "distance matrix") are optionally determined from those positions.

2. While it may seem that relative and absolute positions are mutually exclusive, they are clearly interdependent. That is, in claim 43, we use the relative positions in the course of determining the absolute ones. And clearly, knowing absolute positions, one could calculate the relative positions. Hence,

restriction analysis must treat these as related species.

The restriction should also be withdrawn on the ground that claims (e.g., claim 32) are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By:


Iver P. Cooper
Reg. No. 28,005

624 Ninth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile: (202) 737-3528
IPC:lms
G:\ipc\g-i\hoib\CHRISTENSEN12\christensen12.pto electiontraverse.wpd